



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/696,664	10/25/2000	Mark S. Abad	38-21(51721)B	5102
7590	11/30/2004		EXAMINER	
Lawrence M. Lavin, Jr. Patent Department, E2NA Monsanto Company 800 N. Lindbergh Boulevard St. Louis, MI 63167			BORIN, MICHAEL L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1631	
			DATE MAILED: 11/30/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

**MAILED**

**NOV 30 2004**

**GROUP 1600**

Application Number: 09/696,664  
Filing Date: October 25, 2000  
Appellant(s): ABAD ET AL.

Thomas E. Holsten  
Holly L. Prutz  
David R. Marsh  
For Appellant

**SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to appellant's Reply Brief filed 09/13/2004.

The Reply Brief filed 09/13/2004 addresses rejection under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph. First, Examiner disagrees with the heading "The Examiner's New Points of Argument". All that the following statement (p. 21, first paragraph)

There are two "written description" rejections of record; the first addressing "comprising" language, and the second - addressing "% identity" language. Appellant provides arguments only regarding the first "written description" rejection.

Art Unit: 1631

meant was that there was no response to the second rejection addressing "% identity language". Second, the second title "a. The Rejection Raised Under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph" is not accurate as the discussed rejection is under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph.

As for appellant's argument, Examiner does not find it persuasive. The arguments addressed in the Reply Brief are related to the issue of enablement of products "comprising" certain nucleic acid, be it nucleic acid of SEQ ID No. 3 itself, or another nucleic acid with sequence having certain % identity to SEQ ID No.3. The issue of the second rejection under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph is the lack of written description of nucleotide sequences having less than 100% identity to the elected SEQ ID No. 3. The latter issue is not addressed in the sections of specification addressed by the appellant.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejection should be sustained.  
Respectively submitted,

Michael Borin  
Primary Examiner

